RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Central Valley Project and California Water Fix Overview


September 2015



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation


CVP Background

- California Experiencing Severe Drought and Flooding Occurrences Throughout the State
- State Enacted the Central Valley Project Act in 1933
- Great Depression Prevented State from Funding Project; Transferred to Federal Government
- Reclamation Began Construction in late 1930's With Last Major Construction Completed in 1979



Hydrologic Constraints


- Majority of water supply in the north
- Most of the precipitation is in the winter/spring
- Majority of demand in the south
- Most of that demand is in the summer



CVP
Major Storage
and Conveyance
Facilities

CVP Features Summary

- 18 Dams and Reservoirs
- 500 Miles (800 km) of Canals
- 11 Powerplants
- 10 Pumping Plants
- 20 Percent of State's Developed Water Supply (about 7 million acre-feet, 8.6 billion cu meters)
- 30 Percent of the State's Agricultural Supply (about 3 mil acres of farm land, 1.2 mil hectares)
- 13 Percent of State's M&I Supply (about 2 million people served)





SWP Summary


- 34 Reservoirs/Storage Facilities
- 700 Miles (1,100 km) of Canals and Pipelines
- 5 Powerplants
- 4 Power/Pumping Plants
- 20 Pumping Plants

Biological Opinions

- 2008 FWS Delta Smelt
 - FWS issued a BO/RPA for the Delta Smelt and critical habitat in 2008
 - Reclamation initiated operations under the BO and the RPA in 2008
 - The Ninth Circuit upheld the FWS BO but did require Reclamation to analyze implementation of the RPAs under NEPA
- 2009 NMFS –Salmonid Species, green sturgeon; killer whale
 - NMFS issued a BO w/RPA for the Salmonid Species, sturgeon and killer whale in 2009
 - Reclamation initiated operations under the BO and RPA in 2009
 - The Ninth Circuit upheld the NMFS BO but did require Reclamation to analyze the implementation of the RPAs under NEPA









Key Operating Agreements and Standards

- Water Right Permits
- Water Rights Decision 1641 (SWRCB)
- Biological Opinions (FWS & NMFS)
- Flood Control Manuals
- Coordinated Operations Agreement

History of BDCP

• Planning resumed in 2006 with goal to develop a long-term plan to address water supply reliability and ecosystem health in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta





Project Location and Details

- Three 3,000 cfs Gravity Intakes (9,000 cfs total)
- State of the Art Fish Screens at Intakes
- Two Tunnels to Carry
 Water 30 Miles to Existing
 South Delta Facilities
- Redesign of Clifton Court Forebay
- Habitat Restoration and Protection of Cultivated Lands

Change in Regulatory Approach

- Draft EIS/EIR released December, 2013
- Public comments reflected significant concerns with development of a 50-year HCP
- Difficulty in reaching agreement and consensus among the five agencies regarding details of the HCP
- Significant scientific uncertainty over a 50-year time period especially in light of climate change
- Uncertainty regarding adequate funding over a 50-year timeframe

California WaterFix and EcoRestore

- In April 2015, State and Federal agencies announced Alternative 4A as the State's new proposed project and Reclamation's preferred alternative
- Alternative 4A is State's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore
- California WaterFix is focused on new conveyance and operations
- California EcoRestore is focused on coordinating and advancing at least 30,000 acres of critical habitat restoration in the Delta

Schedule

- BDCP/CWF Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS released: July 10, 2015
- Close of Public Comment Period: October 30, 2015
- Anticipated release of Final EIR/EIS: Early 2016
- Record of Decision: Early 2016

Major Issues Raised by EPA

Water Quality

- Concern over salinity increases in western Delta with the project
- How does project affect potential future changes with SWRCB's Water Quality Control Plan

Fisheries

- Not enough information in NEPA document to conclude that the project is or is not potentially harmful to fish
- Purpose and Need
 - Need for a broader range of differing CVP operations in new alternatives

Questions?

